



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/944,694	08/31/2001	Matthew Gast .	NC30561	2124
· 75	590 11/01/2005		EXAM	INER
Brian T. Rivers, Esq.			HA, LEYNNA A	
Nokia, Inc. Mail drop 1-4-7	755		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
6000 Connection Dr.			2135	
Irving, TX 75039			DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/944,694	GAST, MATTHEW		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		LEYNNA T. HA	2135		
	is communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
Period for Reply					
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing dealer of the prior of the property is specified above, the failure to reply within the set or extended	OM THE MAILING DA the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 te of this communication. te maximum statutory period wi period for reply will, by statute, three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH( ITE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin (ii) apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
	2b)☐ This a condition for allowan	igust 2005. action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allo 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are obj 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject	is/are withdraw wed. ted. ected to.				
Application Papers					
	is/are: a) acce nat any objection to the c (s) including the correcti	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( Paper No(s)/Mail Date	ng Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/944,694 Page 2

Art Unit: 2135

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 has been re-examined and remains rejected.

2. This is a Final rejection.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-2 contains new subject matter, stating "at least a portion of at least some of the network protocol packets being configured in accordance with a transport layer protocol or a network layer protocol".

Specification originally filed fails to explain or describe this new limitation.

Therefore, this constitutes new subject matter being introduced at this time.

Art Unit: 2135

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Binding, et al. (US 6,775,772).

### As per claim 1:

Binding, et al. discloses a method for providing network security, comprising the steps of:

receiving a plurality of network protocol packets, wherein a network protocol packet (col.8, lines 39-67) includes a network protocol header and a plurality of network protocol data, and wherein the network protocol data include a first cryptographic protocol header and a first plurality of encrypted data; (col.12, lines 42-43)

determining a first plurality of cryptographic protocol rules associated with the network protocol data; (col.15, lines 11-28)

establishing a cryptographic session, if required by said first cryptographic rules; (col.15, lines 59-61)

applying the first plurality of cryptographic protocol rules to the first encrypted data to obtain a first plurality of cleartext data; (col.15, lines 45-46)

Art Unit: 2135

translating the first plurality of cleartext data into a second plurality of cleartext data in accordance with at least one translation rule; and (col.15, lines 52-59)

encrypting the second plurality of cleartext data in accordance with at least one rule associated with a second cryptographic protocol, resulting in a second plurality of encrypted data. (col.16, lines 6-10)

### As per claim 2:

Binding, et al. discloses a system for providing network security, comprising: an input module for receiving a plurality of network protocol packets; (col.8, lines 39-67)

a translation module for translating a first plurality of data into a second plurality of data; (col.9, lines 3-5)

an output module; and (col.11, lines 54-65)

a cryptographic module responsive to the input module and the output module for performing cryptographic operations. (col.12, lines 5-20)

### As per claim 3:

Binding, et al. discloses a system for providing network security, comprising: means for receiving a request to perform a cryptographic operation;

### (col.18, lines 19-27)

means for returning a response to the cryptographic operation request; (col.18, lines 37-54)

Art Unit: 2135

means for translating a first plurality of cleartext data into a second plurality of cleartext data in accordance with at least one translation rule; and (col.15, lines 45-53 and col.17, lines 35-47)

at least one module for performing said cryptographic operations, said cryptographic operations including obtaining the first plurality of cleartext data based upon a first plurality of encrypted data (col. 9, lines 4-11), and encrypting the second plurality of cleartext data to obtain a second plurality of encrypted data. (col.19, lines 7-13)

As per claim 4: See col.15, lines 61-62; discussing at least one translation rule is predetermined.

As per claim 5: See col.15, lines 14-15; discussing at least one translation rule is determined dynamically.

As per claim 6: See col.3, lines 5-7; discussing the first cryptographic protocol is WTLS.

As per claim 7: See col.4, lines 61-67; discussing the first plurality of encrypted data is associated with WML.

As per claim 8: See col.4, lines 61-67; discussing second plurality of encrypted data is associated with HTML.

As per claim 9: See col.9, lines 10-14; discussing the second cryptographic protocol is SSL over HTTP.

As per claim 10: See col.16, lines 3-4; discussing the first cryptographic protocol and the second cryptographic protocol are identical.

As per claim 11: See col.16, lines 3-4; discussing the first plurality of

Art Unit: 2135

encrypted data and the second plurality of encrypted data conform to different revisions of a specification for the same cryptographic protocol.

As per claim 12: See col.9, lines 64-65; discussing at least one cryptographic module is a cryptographically strong pseudorandom number generator.

As per claim 13: See col.7, lines 1-10; discussing the cryptographic operations are performed using cryptographic acceleration hardware.

As per claim 14: See col.11, lines 29-35; discussing the cryptographic acceleration hardware includes a plurality of individual hardware acceleration units.

As per claim 15: See col.11, lines 29-35; discussing at least one individual hardware acceleration unit is dedicated to one function.

As per claim 16: See col.10, lines 5-10; discussing the cryptographic acceleration hardware is updateable by loading at least one cryptographically signed instruction.

As per claim 17: See col.12, lines 46-53; discussing the cryptographic acceleration hardware is tamper-resistant.

As per claim 18: See col.12, lines 46-53; discussing the cryptographic acceleration hardware is tamper-evident.

Art Unit: 2135

# Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/16/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner finds the amended claims 1-2 includes new limitation of "at least a portion of at least some of the network protocol packets being configured in accordance with a transport layer protocol or a network layer protocol" because this new subject matter was not disclosed in the originally file specification.

6. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., translating WML data into HTML data) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues Binding fails to disclose translating the first plurality of cleartext which by applicant's example is WML data into a second of plurality of cleartext data (applicant example) which is HTML data. The examiner disagrees with the argument because applicant broadly claims translating the first plurality of cleartext into a second of plurality of cleartext data which does not claim translating the WML data

Art Unit: 2135

into HTML data. So any form of decoding encrypted data being translated or in Binding being re-encrypted and then decoding that first decoded re-encrypted data to the second decoded data according to its parameters meets the amended limitation of claim 3.

### Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEYNNA T. HA

Art Unit: 2135

whose telephone number is (571) 272-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LHa

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2135